UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/523,044	03/10/2000	Takao Chihara	1503.63657	4484

7590 02/05/2004

Patrick G Burns Esq
Greer Burns & Crain Ltd
300 South Wacker Drive Suite 2500
Chicago, IL 60606

EXAMINER	
PILLAI, NAMITHA	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2173	

DATE MAILED: 02/05/2004

16

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/523,044	CHIHARA ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Namitha Pillai	2173	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *13 November 2003*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1,5,6 and 8-11* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1, 5-6 and 8-11* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

13)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

14)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other:

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

1. Claims 1, 5-6 and 8-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U. S. Patent No. 6,061,516 (Yoshikawa et al.) and U. S. Patent No. 5,179,700 (Aihara et al.).

Referring to claims 1, 9 and 10, Yoshikawa discloses a graphical user interface screen generating apparatus that has an extraction unit for extracting screen data from a character-based user interface screen, as seen in Figure 3, the screen data including field information of an output field and an input-output field (column 1, lines 29-33, column 7, lines 11-17 and column 8, lines 20-23). Yoshikawa also discloses a naming unit specifying control names of the fields in the graphical user interface based on a character string of the extracted field information, wherein Yoshikawa clearly shows a relation between the extracted field of "NAME" from the character based extracted information with the newly created field name for "NAME" for the graphical user interface based form (column 11, lines 48-51, lines 55-56, column 10, lines 57-62 and Figure 7). The names of these controls are registered as the control name of the fields in a memory, as seen in Figure 1, which includes information such as the fields names of the controls, it is shown that the computer (reference number 2, Figure 1) would have a memory which would hold this information (column 6, lines 18-20 and Figure 1). Yoshikawa discloses naming the controls wherein, the output and fixed fields clearly have control names that are

associated with each other, wherein as seen in Figure 7, the fixed field is the output field which is in the vicinity of output field and hence the output field has a control name that is associated with the fixed field that is in the vicinity of the fixed field. Nonetheless, as recited in the claims, Yoshikawa does not clearly describe the same case for the input-output fields that are disclosed in the invention. Aihara does disclose the same conversion of a character based user interface into a graphical user interface, as disclosed by Yoshikawa, but goes further to disclose that the input-output fields in Aihara's invention has control names, wherein the graphical user interface screen is based on a character string of the field information of the output field in the vicinity of the input-output field (Figures 9 and 10). In Figure 10, the control names of the input-output fields, for "USER ID" and "PASSWORD" are clearly associated with the character string information of the output field that are in the vicinity of these control fields as also seen by the depiction of this screen in Figure 7. It would have been obvious for one skilled in the art, at the time of the invention to learn from Aihara to implement a means for naming the input-output field name based on the output field that is closet to the input-output field. Both Yoshikawa and Aihara have been means for converting the character based user interface into a graphical user interface, this process involving renaming of the field names and other variables used for setting up the new screen. Thus both these disclosures deal with extracting information from the old screen and forming new control names based on these extracted information. Yoshikawa does have a naming means for the controls of the screens but does not clearly discuss the naming rules for its input-output field, wherein these fields would be named based on the character string of the output field nearest to it. Aihara teaches precisely such a method for naming these input-output fields, which makes it simpler to identify the use of this input-output field rather than the

field names used by Yoshikawa in identifying their input-output fields as seen in Figure 7 of Yoshikawa. Hence, one skilled in the art would have been motivated, at the time of the invention to learn from Aihara to implement a method wherein the input-output control name would be based on the output character string information that is nearest to the input-output field.

Referring to claims 5 and 11, Yoshikawa and Aihara disclose that the control name of the input-output field based on the character string of the output field which is before the input-output field and exists closest to the input-output field, as is the case of the fields and control names "password" and "userid", as seen in Figure 7 of Aihara.

Referring to claim 6, Yoshikawa and Aihara discloses adding a specific character string to one of the registered control names, the control names being either those for the input-output fields and the output field, during the field setting process (Yoshikawa, column 11, lines 56-66 and column 12, lines 1-3).

Referring to claim 8, Yoshikawa and Aihara disclose that a group of predetermined control name specifying rules and regulations are used for adding the specific character string to one of the registered control names of the screen, the controls being input-output fields and output fields (Yoshikawa, column 11, lines 47-67).

Response to Claim Changes

2. The Examiner acknowledges Applicant's amendments to claims 1, 9, 10 to better specify the claimed invention. However, all claims are rejected under 35 U. S. C. 103 as being obvious over the prior art.

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments filed 11/13/03 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

With response to Applicant's arguments that Yoshikawa does not disclose specifying a control name of a field based on a character string of an extracted field information. Yoshikawa clearly discloses that the name of the GUI based input-output field control name is "NAME", wherein this control name is associated with extracted field information of the output field "NAME" (reference number 80, Figure 3), wherein Yoshikawa has clearly pointed out a correlation between these fields and the naming of the field based on this correlation (column 10, lines 57-62).

With respect to Applicant's arguments that Yoshikawa does not disclose extracting field information from a first field and based on this extracted information specifying a control name. Yoshikawa clearly discloses a "Screen Definition Information" module, wherein this module would hold all types of information concerning the contents of a screen, and wherein these contents as seen in Figure 7 would include control names, and hence these control names would be accessed from the screen definition information and then used for creating the control names of the new graphical user interface. The extraction process is clearly shown in two occasions, first being when the screen information is taken from the screen and stored in the screen definition information and the second occasion being when the field information from a first field is extracted from the screen definition information and used for determining a control name for the graphical user interface.

With respect to Applicant's arguments that Aihara does not disclose specifying names in the vicinity of the input-output field based on respective names in an output field. Aihara clearly

discloses in Figure 10, wherein the output fields are "USER ID" and "PASSWORD" and wherein the input-output fields that are near these output fields are given control names that are based on the names of the output fields, as shown, wherein in Figure 10, the input-output fields are given the control names "password" and "userid". Hence, Aihara does disclose specifying names in the vicinity of the input-output field based on respective names in an output field.

With respect to Applicant's arguments that Aihara does not specify the new names based on the respective control names in the vicinity of the output field but instead uses the same names as in the original panel for the creation of the new panel. This may be the case as per the example shown in Aihara but regardless, as disclosed in the present invention's claims, the control names of the input-output field are based on the names of the output fields that are near these respective input-output fields, thereby clearly teaching this method disclosed in the claims, and furthermore, there has been no clear discussion of "new" names that are created as a result of the naming process in the claims as disclosed.

Conclusion

4. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,

however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Responses to this action should be mailed to: Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks, Washington D.C. 20231. If applicant desires to fax a response, central FAX number (703) 872-9306 may be used. NOTE: A Request for Continuation (Rule 60 or 62) cannot be faxed. Please label "PROPOSED" or "DRAFT" for informal facsimile communications. For after final responses, please label "AFTER FINAL" or "EXPEDITED PROCEDURE" on the document. Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington. VA., Sixth Floor (Receptionist). Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Namitha Pillai whose telephone number is (703) 305-7691. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30 AM - 5:30 PM. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Cabeca can be reached on (703) 308-3116. All Internet e-mail communications will be made of record in the application file. PTO employees do not engage in Internet communications where there exists a possibility that sensitive information could be identified or exchanged unless the record includes a properly signed express waiver of the confidentiality requirements of 35 U.S.C. 122. This is more clearly set forth in the Interim Internet Usage Policy published in the Official Gazette of the Patent and Trademark on February 25, 1997 at 1195 OG 89. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3800.

Namitha Pillai
Assistant Examiner
Art Unit 2173
January 29, 2004

JOHN CABECA
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER